UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FIGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

CHRISTINE MONAHAN,

Plaintiff

V.

NATIONAL RAILROAD PASSENGER CORPORATION,)
d/b/a AMTRAK,

Defendant

MAGISTRATE JUDGE

HECEIPT #

j. H. 24

SUMMONS ISSU

OUAL HULE 4.1

VAIVER FORM _

RY DPTY CLK

Plaintiff Christine Monahan brings this Complaint against her employer Amtrak, s

INTRODUCTION

compensation for lost wages and other damages arising out of Defendant's statutory violations. This action seeks relief pursuant to the Americans with Disabilities Act and a declaratory judgment pursuant to 22 U.S.C. § 2201 that Defendant is bound by guidelines promulgated by the Federal Railroad Administration.

PARTIES

- Plaintiff Christine Monahan is an adult individual who resides at 47 Broad Cove Road,
 Hingham, Massachusetts.
- 2. Defendant, National Railroad Passenger Corporation (hereinafter "Amtrak"), is a federally chartered corporation incorporated by Congress in 45 U.S.C. § 501, incorporated under the laws of the District of Columbia and having its principal place of business in the District of Columbia. Amtrak owns and operates interstate railroads and railroad properties as a common carrier of goods and passengers and conducts business in Massachusetts.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 3. The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 42 U.S.C. § 12117. Further, any suit involving Amtrak, as a federal chartered entity, arises under the laws of the United States and confers subject matter jurisdiction over this action.
- 4. Ms. Monahan exhausted all administrative remedies by appealing Amtrak's denial of a reasonable accommodation through Amtrak's internal procedures and by timely filing with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) a Charge of Discrimination pursuant to the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA).
- 5. On April 19, 2005, the EEOC issued to Ms. Monahan a Notice of Suit Rights.
- 6. Venue is proper in this Court because Amtrak employed Plaintiff, and committed the violations of statute, in this judicial district.

FACTS

- 7. Ms. Monahan commenced work as a railroad conductor for Defendant Amtrak in 1989 to operate the MBTA commuter rail.
- 8. As a conductor, Ms. Monahan was subject to drug testing under regulations and guidelines promulgated by the Department of Transportation and the Federal Railroad Administration.
- 9. Ms. Monahan served Defendant diligently and met all of her obligations to Defendant.
- 10. At no time was Ms. Monahan suspected of using illegal narcotics of any kind.
- 11. Ms. Monahan commenced a medical leave August 27, 2001 to undergo gastric bypass surgery.
- 12. In January 2002, Ms. Monahan submitted to a return-to-duty drug test. After approximately four hours, Ms. Monahan was informed that she had not provided a sufficient volume of urine

- sample for testing. In addition, Ms. Monahan had not fully recovered from her surgery and was not physically capable of performing all the essential functions of her position.
- 13. By May 2002, Ms. Monahan was fully recovered from her surgery and capable of performing all the essential functions of her position.
- 14. On May 2, 2002, Ms. Monahan again submitted to a return-to-duty drug test. During a three-hour test period on May 2, 2002, Ms. Monahan attempted unsuccessfully to provide a urine sample. She consumed in excess of forty ounces of water, and repeatedly informed the supervising nurse that she was unable to void, despite her attempts and desire to do so.
- 15. Ms. Monahan suffers from a permanent impairment known as paruresis, colloquially referred to as shy bladder condition. Ms. Monahan's permanent impairment is caused in part by chronic pelvic floor dysfunction.
- 16. Paruresis is recognized in the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders Fourth Edition (DSM-IV), published by the American Psychiatric Association in 1994, as a specific social phobia which manifests itself as a physical inability to urinate in public or when being pressured or evaluated.
- 17. As a direct result of being afflicted with paruresis, Ms. Monahan was unable to provide a urine sample for the return-to-duty drug test May 2, 2002.
- 18. Ms. Monahan obtained an independent blood test from a qualified physician on the same day as the return-to-duty test which showed she tested negative for illegal narcotics of any kind.
- 19. Amtrak has refused to accept the results of Ms. Monahan's May 2, 2002 blood test.
- 20. Since May 2002, Ms. Monahan has been ready and willing to submit to an alternative

- collection method, such as by providing a blood sample or hair sample, to comply with Amtrak's drug testing requirements.
- 21. Permitting Ms. Monahan to provide a blood sample or hair sample as an alternative means of complying with Amtrak's return-to-duty drug testing requirements is a reasonable accommodation as defined by the Americans with Disability Act.
- 22. Permitting Ms. Monahan to provide a blood sample or hair sample as an alternative means of complying with Amtrak's return-to-duty drug testing requirements is specifically permitted by the Federal Railroad Administration guideline 49 CFR § 40.195.
- 23. Amtrak has prevented Ms. Monahan from returning to active duty by repeatedly refusing since May 2002 to grant the reasonable accommodation of an alternative drug testing procedure.
- 24. Amtrak has been aware Ms. Monahan suffers from paruresis since January 1992.
- 25. In 1995, due to Ms. Monahan's permanent impairment, Amtrak established a written protocol for acquiring a random drug test specimen from Ms. Monahan. This protocol was in effect for Ms. Monahan until 2001.
- 26. In July 2002, Amtrak requested Ms. Monahan to submit to certain urological testing to reconfirm her shy bladder condition. Amtrak's request constituted an adverse action against a qualified individual with a disability because the required testing posed a medical risk to Ms. Monahan, in light of the size of her remaining stomach pouch after the gastric bypass surgery.
- 27. Amtrak suspended Ms. Monahan without pay, cancelled her insurance benefits, and took other adverse actions against her because she could not provide the required urine sample.
- 28. Amtrak's conduct constitutes discrimination against a qualified individual with a disability under the ADA which has caused, and continues to cause, Ms. Monahan significant damages.

CLAIMS FOR RELIEF

COUNT I

Violations of the Americans with Disabilities Act 42 U.S.C. §12111 et seq.

- 29. Ms. Monahan hereby realleges and incorporates by reference every allegation contained in paragraphs 1-28.
- 30. At all times relevant, Amtrak was an employer covered by the ADA.
- 31. At all times relevant, Ms. Monahan was qualified and capable of performing the essential functions of her position.
- 32. Starting in 1991, Ms. Monahan was a qualified individual with a disability who could perform the essential functions of her position with a reasonable accommodation.
- Ms. Monahan's paruresis is a permanent impairment which substantially impedes Ms.Monahan's major life function of voiding her bladder.
- 34. Because of the prevalence of return-to-duty drug testing and random drug testing in the workplace, Ms. Monahan's permanent impairment significantly restricts her ability to perform either a class of jobs or a broad range of jobs in various classes as compared to the average person having comparable training, skills, and abilities.
- 35. Amtrak violated the ADA by denying Ms. Monahan's request for a reasonable accommodation.
- 36. Amtrak violated the ADA by retaliating against Ms. Monahan after she sought a reasonable accommodation, by suspending Ms. Monahan without pay, cancelling her insurance benefits, and taking other adverse actions against her.

Declaratory Judgment 22 U.S.C. § 2201

- 37. Ms. Monahan hereby realleges and incorporates by reference every allegation contained in paragraphs 1-36.
- 38. The Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) guideline regarding return-to-duty drug testing collection procedures in cases where an individual is unable to provide a sufficient amount of urine for a return-to-duty test because of a permanent or long-term medical condition, 49 CFR § 40.195, specifically permits Amtrak to "conduct an alternative test (e.g. blood) as part of the medically appropriate procedures in determining clinical evidence of drug use."
- 39. Amtrak failed and refused to comply with 49 CFR § 40.195 in regard to Ms. Monahan's return-to-duty drug test.
- 40. Amtrak's refusal to comply with the FRA guideline presents a justiciable controversy because Ms. Monahan suffered actual injury and there is dispute as to whether Amtrak may continue to disregard this testing guideline in the future.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff demands judgment in her favor and prays that this Court:

- a. on Count I, enter a monetary award to compensate Plaintiff for the actual damages she suffered, including Plaintiff's reasonable attorneys' fees;
- b. on Count II, enter declaratory relief requiring Defendant comply with 49 CFR §40.195;
- c. award Plaintiff statutory interest and the costs of this action; and
- d. grant such other and further relief as this Court deems just.

DEMAND FOR TRIAL BY JURY

Plaintiff demands trial by jury as to all issues so triable.

Respectfully submitted, Christine Monahan

By her attorneys,

Date: June 10, 2005

Edward S. Englander (BBO # 154540) Denise A. Chicoine (BBO # 564152) ENGLANDER & CHICOINE P.C. Two Newton Place, Suite 200

Newton, MA 02458-1633 Tel. (617) 964-5400

UNTIFID STATES DISTRICT COURT

	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS						
1.	TITILE OF CASE (NAME OF FIRST PARTY ON EACH SIDE ONLY) Monahan v. Na	TLE OF CASE (NAME OF FIRST PARTY ON FACH SIDE ONLY) Monahan v. National Railroad					
	Corporation	1 1 11 11 24					
2	CATEGORY IN WHICH THE CASE BILLONGS BASED UPON THE NUMBERED NATURE COVER SHEET. (SEE LOCAL RULE 40.1(A)(1)).	TEGORY IN WHICH THE CASE BELONGS BASED UPON THE NUMBERED NATURE OF SUIT CODE LISTED ON THE CIVIL. VER SHEET. (SEE LOCAL RULE 40.1(A)(1)).					
	L 160, 410, 470, R.23, REGARDLESS OF NATURE OF SUIT.	er to age					
	X II. 195, 368, 400, 440, 441-444, 540, 550, 625, 710, 720, 730, 740, 790, 791, 820, 830, 840, 850, 892-894, 895, 950.						
	III. 110, 120, 130, 140, \$1, 30, 210, 230, 240, 245, 290, 310, 315, 320, 330, 349, 35, 350, 355, 360, 362, 365, 370, 371, 380, 385, 450, 83						
	IV. 220, 422, 423, 440, 510, 530, 610, 620, 630, 640, 650, 660, 690, 810, 861, 463,870, 871, 875, 900.						
	V. 150, 152 150						
3.	TITLE AND NUMBER AF ANY, OF RELATED CASES. (SEE LOCAL RULE 40.1(E)). None	·					
4.	HAS A PRIOR ACTION BETWEEN THE SAME PARTIES AND BASED ON THE SAME CLAIM EVER BEEN FILED IN THIS COURT? NO						
5.	DOES THE COMPLAINT IN THIS CASE QUESTION THE CONSTITUTIONALITY OF AN ACT OF CONGRESS AFFECTING THE PUBLIC INTEREST: No						
ú .	IF SO, IS THE U.S.A. OR AN OFFICER, AGENT OR EMPLOYEE OF THE U.S. A PARTY? IS THIS CASE REQUIRED TO BE HEARD AND DETERMINED BY A DISTRICT COURTITLE 28 USC 2284? No.	· -					
7	DO ALL PARTIES IN THIS ACTION RESIDE IN THE CENTRAL SECTION OF THE DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS (WORCESTER COUNTY) - (SEE LOCAL RULE 40.1(C)). YES OR IN THE WESTERN SECTION (BERKSHIRE FRANKLIN, HAMPDEN OR HAMPSHIRE COUNTIES)? - (SEE LOCAL RULE 40.1(D)). YES						
8.	DO ALL OF THE PARTIES RESIDING IN MASSACHUSETTS RESIDE IN THE CENTRAL ADISTRICT?—YES	IND/OR WESTERN SECTIONS OF THE IF YES, IN WHICH SECTION DOES					
9.	IN WHICH SECTION DO THE ONLY PARTIES RESIDING IN MASSACHUSETTS RESIDI	? Eastern					
10.	AGENCY OF THE PARTIES ARE THE UNITED STATES, COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACT AGENCY OF THE U.S.A. OR THE COMMONWEALTH, DO ALL OTHER PARTIES RESIL OR WESTERN SECTION						
	LEASE TYPE OR PRINT) ITORNEY'S NAME Englander and Chicoine						
ADDRESS Two Newton Place, Suite 200; Newton, MA 02458							
ПП	ELEPHONE NO. (617) 964-5400						
(Category.frm - 09/92)							

J\$ 44 (Rev. 07/89)

CIVIL COVER SHEET

The JS-44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filling and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of Initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON THE REVERSE OF THE FORM.)

I (a) PLAINTIFFS	DEFENDAN	DEFENDANTS - SETTICE					
Christine Mona	National	National Railroad Passenger Corporation					
(b) COUNTY OF RESIDEN (EXC	NOTE: IN LAND C	COUNTY OF RESIDENCE OF FIRST LISTED DEFENDANT SUFFOLK (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY) NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE TRACT OF LAND INVOLVED					
(C) ATTORNEYS (FIRM NA	ME ADDRESS AND TELE	PHONE NUMBER)	ATTORNEYS (IF KNOWN)				
Englander and Two Newton Pla Newton, MA 024 (617) 964-5400	Chicoine ace 58	,		,			
II. BASIS OF JUR	ISDICTION (PLA	CE AN × IN ONE BOX ONLY)	III. CITIZENSHIP	OF PRINC		S (PLACE AN × IN ONE BOX NTIFF AND ONE BOX FOR DEFENDANT)	
□ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff □ 2 U.S. Government Defendant □ 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)		Citizen of This State Citizen of Another State Citizen or Subject of a Foreign Country	PTF DEF 1 11 2 11 3 13	1 Incorporated or Principal Place ☐ 4 ☐ 4 ☐ 4 ☐ 6 ☐ Business in This State 2 Incorporated and Principal Place ☐ 5 ☐ 5 ☐ 6 ☐ Business in Another State			
V. NATURE OF SU	то	RTS	FORFEITURE /PENALTY		BANKRUPTCY	OTHER STATUTES	
☐ 110 Insurance ☐ 120 Marine ☐ 130 Miller Act ☐ 140 Negotlable Instrument ☐ 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement Judgment ☐ 151 Medicare Act ☐ 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excl. Veterans)	PERSONAL INJURY 310 Airplane Product Liability 320 Assault, Libel & Slander 336 Federal Employers Liability 340 Marine 345 Marine Product Liability	PERSONAL INJURY 362 Personal Injury — Med Malpractice 365 Personal Injury — Product Liability 368 Asbestos Personal Injury Product Liability PERSONAL PROPERTY 370 Other Fraud	G10 Agriculture G20 Other Food & Drug G25 Drug Related Seizure Property 21 USC 8i G30 Liquor Laws G40 R.R & Truck G50 Airline Regs G60 Occupational Safety/Health G90 Other	PR0 □ 820 □ 830 □ 840	28 USC 158 Withdrawal 28 USC 157 PERTY RIGHTS Copyrights	□ 400 State Reapportionment □ 410 Antifrust □ 430 Banks and Banking □ 450 Commerce/ICC Rates/etc □ 460 Deportation □ 470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations □ 810 Selective Service □ 850 Securities/Commodities/	
□ 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits □ 160 Stockholders' Suits □ 190 Other Contract □ 195 Contract Product Liability	☐ 350 Motor Vehicle ☐ 355 Motor Vehicle Product Liability ☐ 360 Other Personal Injury	□ 371 Truth in Lending □ 380 Other Personal Property Damage Property Damage Product Liability	Fair Labor Standards Act Labor/Mgmt. Relations T30 Labor/Mgmt.	s 361 362 363 364	HIA (1395ff) Black Lung (923) DIWC/DIWW (405(g)) SSID Title XVI RSI (405(g))	□ 875 Customer Challenge 12 USC 3410 □ 891 Agricultural Acts □ 892 Economic Stabilization Act □ 893 Environmental Matters	
REAL PROPERTY 210 Land Condemnation 220 Foreclosure 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment 240 Torts to Land 245 Tort Product Liability 290 All Other Real Property	CIVIL RIGHTS 441 Voting 442 Employment 443 Housing/ Accommodations 444 Wettare 440 Other Civil Rights	PRISONER PETITIONS 510 Motions to Vacate Sentence Habeas Corpus: 530 General 535 Death Penalty 540 Mandamus & Other 550 Other	Reporting & Disclosure Act Disclosure Act Act Allway Labor Act D 790 Other Labor Litigation D Fmpl. Ret. Inc. Security Act	[] 870	RAL TAX SUITS Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff or Defendant) IRS—Third Party 26 USC 7609	□ 894 Energy Allocation Act □ 895 Freedom of Information Act □ 900 Appeal of Fee Determinatio Under Equal Access to Justice □ 950 Constitutionality of State Statutes □ 890 Other Statutory Actions	
VI. ORIGIN 1 Original Proceeding	2 Removed from State Court		4 Reinstated or ☐ 5 a	Transferred from another district (specify)	口 6 Multidistri Litigation	Appeal to District 7 Judge from	
VII. REQUESTED COMPLAINT:		DEMAND \$ Check YES only if demanded in complaint: JURY DEMAND: ☑ YES ☐ NO					
VIII. RELATED CA			DGE	DOCKET NUMBER			
DATE	SIGNAT	URE OF ATTORNEY OF F	RECORD		11	//	
6/10/05			Clic	1 11	1 1	11/20	